

LUC-369 / Ejzak 32-4

## Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. By this amendment, claims 14 and 19 are amended. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification (e.g., page 10, line 25 to page 11, line 1) and figures (e.g., FIGS. 2-4) and thus, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 1-13 were allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge this indication of allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 14, 15, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Ejzak (U.S. Patent No. 6,871,070). Claims 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ejzak in view of Denman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,451; "Denman"). These rejections are respectfully, but most strenuously, traversed.

The amendments to the claims presented herewith recite the limitation of sending the SIP message without SDP information in independent claims 14 and 19. As argued in the Response filed February 5, 2007, Applicants respectfully submit that Ejzak and Denman fail to disclose sending the SIP message without SDP information. This point is conceded in the Office Action (page 3, line 26 to page 4, line 3):